



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/182,825	10/29/1998	WARNER R.T. TEN KATE	PHN-16.695	PHN-16.695 2426	
24737	7590 11/18/2003		EXAMINER		
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			HONG, STEPHEN S		
P.O. BOX 300 BRIARCLIFE	01 FMANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
Diam.			2178	22-	
			DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			ARG
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/182,825	TEN KATE, WARNER R.T.	
-	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen S. Hong	2178	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	}SS <b></b>
THE REPLY FILED 04 November 2003 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the same of the	ition. A proper reply n places the application	to a on in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	•		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the control of	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI fextension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection IE FINAL REJECTION. S R 1.136(a) and the appropunt of the fee. The appropersion of the fee. The final Option of the	n. See MPEP  priate extension priate extension office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a)  they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed ar	mendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were i	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo			d an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disappr	oved by the Examine	er.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	t(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·	
10. Other:	·	STEPHEN S. HON PHIMARY EXAMINE	G ER



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments are not persuasive (see pages 8-9 of Office Action, Paper #22. Furthermore, the argument that Gudmondson's object may contain "code" in addition to "data structure" has no bearing on the rejection. Gudmondson needs at least show the feature. The refence can contain additional features (as long as the additional feature does not contract the claimed feature).